

Serial No. 10/521,389**Atty. Doc. No. 2002P08101WOUS****REMARKS**

Claims 16-19, 22 and 24-35 are in the application. Claims 20, 21 and 23 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 16-19, 22, 27, 29-31 and 35 have been rejected under Section 102(e) based on Nuovo (U.S. 20040102230), while claims 24-26, 28, and 32-34 are rejected under Section 103 based on combinations of Nuovo with Gahl (US 2004/0082370) and Montminy (US 2004/0211668). Reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claim 16 (amended) was rejected under Section 102 based on disclosure in the Nuovo reference of:

- (a) a combination of a front face 3 with a Perspex™ layer 37;
- (b) a combination of a side frame 20 with a housing element/bezel 19; and
- (c) a combination of a rail 23 and sealant 69.

To more clearly and further distinguish the invention of Claim 16, the claim is now directed to an enclosure "for housing a device." The recited combination of elements from the Nuovo reference is insufficient to perform this function. For example, claim 16 now expressly requires that the

"first enclosure base body and... second enclosure base body ... together, contain the device..."

Moreover, applicant's claimed enclosure now requires that the

"first enclosure base body [comprise] a first edge flange positioned along an outer periphery thereof and configured to extend into the second enclosure base body..."

The Nuovo reference is devoid of such structure. The invention of claim 16 is further distinguished by

"the second enclosure base body ... comprising a second edge along an outer periphery thereof, including a first recess for receiving the first edge flange, wherein the first enclosure base body and the second enclosure base body butt against one another along the first edge flange and the first recess ..."

Serial No. 10/521,389

Atty. Dec. No. 2002P08101WOUS

None of this structure is taught or suggested by any of the art of record. It is submitted that the combination of claim 16 is both distinct and non-obvious. Allowance is requested.

Claim 17 (amended) further distinguishes applicant's invention, requiring that:

"one of the first enclosure base body and the second enclosure base body comprises a second edge flange positioned along an outer periphery thereof and configured to extend into a second recess formed along the outer periphery of the other enclosure base body."

By way of example, Figure 8 of the present application illustrates an embodiment which claim 17 reads upon.

Claim 18 (amended) also further distinguishes the invention, requiring that

"one of the first enclosure base body and the second enclosure base body comprises a third edge flange positioned between the first and second edge flanges and configured to extend into a third recess formed along the outer periphery of the other enclosure base body."

No combination of the art of record suggests these features.

In view of the amendment to claim 16, the rejection of claims 24-26 and 28 under section 103 can no longer apply, as none of the secondary references compensate for the deficiencies present in the Nuovo reference. Further, each of the claims 19-31 which depend from claim 16, as now presented, define additional features which patentably distinguish the invention.

Claim 35 was also rejected under section 102 based on the Nuovo reference. For reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 16, claim 35 (amended) is now fully distinguished and non-obvious over the art of record. For example, claim 35 now requires

"a flange formed along the edge perimeter extending in a direction to press against the mating surface when contact with the mating surface is made..."

Claims 32 - 34 have been rejected based on a combination of Nuovo in view of Gahl. However, this rejection is apparently dependent on an incorrect conclusion: that the Gahl reference discloses "injecting a soft component forming an elastic seal onto the hard component ...". It is respectfully submitted that the reference does not disclose such subject matter. Moreover, the citation in the Gahl reference (par. 0013) does not even appear to suggest any

Serial No. 10/521,389**Atty. Doc. No. 2002P08101WOUS**

difference in hardness such that either the first component or the second component would be characterized as a hard component or a soft component. For these reasons, it is submitted that claim 32 and the claims which depend there from are each distinct and non-obvious over any combination of the cited art.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the amendments and argument now presented, each of the claims is in condition for allowance and the examiner is asked to pass this application to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/20/06

By: 

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830